

Appl. No. 10/550,053
Amdt. dated July 1, 2008
Reply to Office action of Apr. 4, 2008

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig.'s 1-3. These sheets, which include Fig.'s 1-3, replace the original sheets including Fig.'s 1-3. In Fig.'s 1-3 a previously omitted label as "Prior Art" has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the present application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-27 remain in this application.

The holding of allowable subject matter in claims 4, 6, 7, 9-12, 18-20, 22, and 24 is gratefully acknowledged.

Drawing objections

In the Office action the Examiner objected to Fig.'s 1-3 for not being designated with a legend such as --Prior Art--. This Amendment revises Fig.'s 1-3 to correct this informality. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the drawings objection and approval of the enclosed, proposed Replacement drawings.

Claim objections

Claim 1 has been amended to correct the typographical error noted by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that this correction does not affect the scope of the claim.

Claims 21 and 24 have also been amended to correct minor grammatical errors. These corrections are not in response to any rejection or objection and are not believed to affect the scope of the claim.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these claim amendments should not give rise to any filewrapper estoppel.

Rejection under section 112

Claims 15-17 stand rejected because of the character string (Capacitor) that appears in the text. This character string is from Figures 10 and 12. This character string is used to label one of the waveforms in each of those figures. The following material is quoted from the MPEP.

608.01(m) Form of Claims [R-3]

...Reference characters corresponding to elements recited in the detailed description and the drawings may be used in conjunction with the recitation of the same element or group of elements in the claims. The reference characters, however, should be enclosed within parentheses so as to avoid confusion with other numbers or characters which may appear in the claims. The use of reference characters is to be considered as having no effect on the scope of the claims. ...

The reference element here is properly enclosed in parentheses and capitalized in the same fashion that it is used in the figures. Rejection of the claims for insertion of a reference element in parentheses is improper and accordingly respectfully traversed.

Art rejections

The art rejections are respectfully traversed.

Since the references are complex, Applicant will confine his remarks to those portions of the references cited by the Examiner, except as otherwise indicated. Applicant makes no representation as to the contents of other portions of the references.

Any of the Examiner's rejections and/or points of argument that are not addressed below would appear to be moot in view of the following. Nevertheless, Applicant reserves the right to respond to those rejections and arguments and to advance additional arguments at a later date. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection over Knapp under section 102(b) is not appropriate. That section requires a reference to be published more than one year prior to the filing date of the application rejected. The priority date of the present application is March 27, 2003. The publication date of the Knapp reference is Dec. 24, 2002, less than one year prior to the priority date.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites providing first and second drive signals to each pixel for storage on the pixel for first and second periods of time. The durations of the first and second periods of time are controlled to vary pixel light output.

Knapp is cited by the Examiner. Knapp shows a scheme for allowing scan direction to be reversed or for implementing a dot inversion drive scheme, rather than for varying pixel light output. The row signals do have more than one voltage level; however,

it does not appear that both levels are pixel drive levels as claimed by Applicant, since they do not appear to vary pixel light output, but rather simply allow for voltages to be reversed, so far as Applicant can tell.

The periods of Knapp's special signals along the rows may be varied, per the section cited by the Examiner (cols 5 and 6); however, Applicant does not understand that these variations have any effect on pixel light output, especially since the voltages do not rise to the level of pixel select signals (per col. 4, lines 56 et seq.). In any case, the variations are only explained as permissible ranges. The effect of the different voltages row signals appears to be due to the levels of these signals, not their duration.

Applicant accordingly does not believe that the reference at least as explained by the Examiner teaches or suggests the invention. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 23

This claim recites analogue pixel drive signals.

In rejecting this claim over Dawson, the Examiner fails to indicate where the pixel drive signals are analogue. Clarification is accordingly respectfully requested.

Also the claim recites timing means for controlling duration of the application of pixel drive signals.

The Examiner points to the display controller for this limitation. Dawson does not say much about this display controller. Applicant suspects, however, that the only timing means it would be likely to have would be a generalized clocking mechanism. Applicant

Appl. No. 10/550,053
Amdt. dated July 1, 2008
Reply to Office action of Apr. 4, 2008

suspects that there is no timing means that is specifically for controlling the duration of pixel drive signals. Reconsideration is accordingly respectfully requested.

New claim 25 clarifies that the timing means varies the duration of at least one pixel drive signal within a field in order to achieve a desired rms and/or mean voltage of the pixel drive signal within that field, whereby an amount of light output by the corresponding pixel is varied responsive to variations in duration of the pixel drive signal. Applicant respectfully submits that this is not taught or suggested by the reference.

New Independent claim

Applicant respectfully submits that new independent claim 26 distinguishes even more clearly over the references than the existing independent claims by specifying more detail about how voltages are controlled — in particular, variation of a parameter relating to timing in order to achieve a desired rms and/or mean voltage and therefore a desired contrast.

Dependent claims

The Examiner has rejected a number of dependent claims generally over Knapp, but has not separated out in the rejections what the grounds are for each dependent claim. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of the dependent claims therefore fail to satisfy 37 CFR 1.104.

Applicant further respectfully submits that the rejected dependent claims recite further patentable distinctions over the reference. Some examples follow.

Claim 3

This claim recites second row pulse on a row conductor timed with the application of the second drive voltage on the column conductor. This is within a field, because the claim depends from claim 1.

So far as Applicant can tell from Knapp, the second pulse on the row conductor is not timed with a second drive voltage on the column conductor within a field. Applicant does not believe, therefore, that the reference teaches or suggests claim 3. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 16

This claim recites a voltage waveform for the pixel drive signal that has two levels. Applicant is not seeing this taught or suggested in Knapp, where it appears that the pixel drive signal has only one level, as opposed to the row drive signal, which apparently has more than one. Reconsideration is accordingly respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that he has addressed each issue raised by the Examiner — except for any that were skipped as moot — and that the application is accordingly in condition for allowance. Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/550,053
Amdt. dated July 1, 2008
Reply to Office action of Apr. 4, 2008

Please charge any fees other than the issue fee to deposit account 14-1270.

Please credit any overpayments to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By ***/Anne E. Barschall/***
Anne E. Barschall, Reg. No. 31,089
Tel. no. 914-332-1019
Fax no. 914-332-7719

.By /Frank J. Keegan/
Frank J. Keegan, Reg. 50,145
Attorney
(914) 333-9669
July 1, 2008